

(d) REMARKS

The claims are 12 and 13. Claim 12 is amended to better define the intended invention.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under Rule 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement in that the impedance regulation means are said to be present on the side of the movable reactor section and not within the movable reactor section. The Examiner notes matching device 112' is on the side of the high frequency power supply means 111 and not within the movable reaction section.

Initially, claim 12 has been amended to provide for a set of movable reactors. The impedance regulation means are provided on the side of each movable reactor. The impedance regulator means act to regulate and match impedances on the side of the reactor and the high frequency power source.

The impedance regulation means is not a high frequency matching device, but is a matching circuit unit. As disclosed on page 21, lines 14-22, the matching circuit units (101U); (151U) and (161U) are not provided in a high frequency matching device 112', but in each of the movable reactor sections. The specification on page 22, line 8 has been corrected to reflect that the presence of the matching circuit units on the side of the movable reactor sections make it unnecessary for the variable capacitor in each high frequency matching device to be set variable in a wide range (see page 20, lines 1-10).

The specification on page 22, lines 4-9 and at page 28, lines 8-13 teach that the impedance regulator 240, 340 is on the side of the movable reactor.

Because claim 12 has been amended to emphasize that the impedance regulating means is spaced, inter alia, in each of the movable reactor units as shown on page 21, line 14 to page 22, line 10 and in Fig. 5, it is unnecessary for a variable capacitor in a high frequency matching device 112 to be adjusted, which simplifies handling and reduces selection errors. Since the impedance regulating means is spaced on each moveable reactor, then microadjustment of impedance is simplified. Accordingly, matching adjustment is not required even though reactors of different impedance are employed, as shown in Example 1. As shown in Comparative Example 1 where impedance regulators were not individually provided for the movable reactor sections having different impedances, then high frequency matching devices in the high frequency power supply means were replaced to correspond to the reactor sections in order to match impedances. As noted on specification pages 34 and 35, the deposition operation was delayed as compared to operations in Example 1. In Example 1, only one set of matching devices is used, while in Comparative Example 1, two sets of matching devices must be used.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected as obvious over Okamura (JP '546) in view of Turlot '986. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Okamura, as admitted by the Examiner, fails to teach individual impedance regulation means for each moveable reactor. Okamura requires matching adjustment each time a reactor with a different impedance is used. This deficiency is not remedied by Turlot.

Turlot does not disclose separate reactors and high-frequency power supply means, a moving means for moving the reactors or a plurality of reactors having impedances different from each other. Further, Turlot neither discloses nor suggests that an impedance regulation means is provided in each movable reactor.

In addition, Turlot discloses, as provided in column 1, lines 16-24, a plasma treatment apparatus by which a number of work-pieces may be parallel-processed. Fig. 5(c) of Turlot shows, as explained at column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 11, that to effect parallel processing, adjusted power is simultaneously fed to the respective chambers from a central generator with a centralized matching network and, if necessary, with additional matching networks for chamber specific adjustment (column 7, lines 1-9). In Turlot, when reactors having different impedances are used, matching adjustment is needed each time.

In contrast, according to the present invention, when the reactors having different impedances are used, matching adjustment is not needed every time.

The present invention relates to a technique for enabling processing under different conditions (specification page 7, lines 5 to page 8, line 15) and Example 1 shows this as a specific example. According to the present invention, even if the impedance of reactors changes, specifically designed matching devices are not necessary each time and microadjusting of impedance can be made by one matching device. Turlot neither discloses nor suggests such features. Further, Turlot neither discloses nor suggests that the impedance regulation means are provided on the side of the reactor.

The amendment should be entered since it responds to the Examiner's invitation to clarify the claimed invention. Accordingly, the final rejection should be withdrawn, the claims allowed and the case passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Saxon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 509721v1